

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
BEAUFORT DIVISION

Kenneth Lane Jackson, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
v. )  
)  
Nancy A. Berryhill, Acting Commissioner )  
Of Social Security, )  
)  
Defendant. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

C/A No. 9:18-cv-727-TMC

**ORDER**

Plaintiff, Kenneth Lane Jackson, brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) seeking judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying his claim for Disability Insurance Benefits (“DIB”) and Supplemental Security Income (“SSI”) pursuant to the Social Security Act. (ECF No. 1). This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“Report”) of the United States Magistrate Judge, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a) (D.S.C.). (ECF No. 16). In his Report, the magistrate judge recommends the Commissioner’s final decision be reversed and this case be remanded. (ECF No. 16 at 10). The Commissioner has filed a response to the Report in which she states that she does not intend to file any objections to the Report. (ECF No. 17).

The Report has no presumptive weight and the responsibility to make a final determination in this matter remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). In the absence of objections, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but

instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

After a thorough and careful review of the record, the court adopts the Report of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 16), which is incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, the Commissioner’s final decision denying benefits is **REVERSED and this case is REMANDED** pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. 405 (g) for further administrative action consistent with the Report.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Timothy M. Cain  
United States District Judge

Anderson, South Carolina  
April 10, 2019

